3: Wallace & Hoebel E-4, 5 (1933, 1945) 1952
NO6 Comanche NO6

meet him secretly, or her real husband will be angry." It was also expected that when a man was on the warpath, his brother could sleep with his wife. If all the brothers were out on a raid, the wives were sent to stay with their husbands' sisters. In wife-exchange the rights of the husband were fully recognized, and he was compensated for restraining his jealousy partly by social approval of his generosity, partly by his expectation of a return in kind. So strong was the idea that brothers share a wife that it logically followed that men who had sexual relations with a married woman were, in a formal sense, brothers. So it was that an outraged husband prosecuting an adulterer, demanding heavy damages, nevertheless addressed the man who had cuckolded him as "brother."

This practice indicates that brothers with their sisters formed a marriage group, which established relationships with another marriage group on the basis of inter-family exchange marriage. Although individual marriages took place between the members of the two groups (no group marriage), there was a projection of the marital rights of each member of the group to all its members of the same sex —in the present through sororal polygyny and fraternal polyandry (anticipatory levirate); in futurity through the sororate and levirate. One's father and the father's brothers were thus equated in the kinship system as *ap'*, because they were actual or potential mates to one's mother under polyandry or the levirate. One's mother and her sisters were equated as *pia*, because they were actual or potential mates to one's father as members of the same marriage group. A man called his brother's child his own (*tua*, "son," or *bet*, "daughter"), since they were descendants of his marriage group, but he terminologically distinguished his sisters' children, *ata*, because they were in another marriage group. Likewise, a woman called her sister's child "son" or "daughter" but distinguished her brother's child, *paha*. A woman who lost her husband by death was inherited by a brother of her husband. Thus brothers were potential husbands of a woman whether they ever became such in actuality. Hence, there was no separate word for brother-in-law, only *kumaxp*, "husband."

The marriage of a man to the daughter of his deceased wife's brother was not a standard Comanche practice; the custom is usually found only in societies that have patrilineal clans in which the wife's

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

127 pecially if one accepts the implication of the necessity for comparative background contained in the first part of the quotation. This scheme is basic to a number of North American studies contained in the *Social Anthropology of North American Tribes*, edited by Fred Eggan,[4] and will be followed here, though without strict adherence in detail to the method of the Eggan volume.

THE KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY

601 The list of terms which identify relatives among the Comanche are given in a separate table, the first being descriptive, and those in parentheses the forms used in direct address. With them are included the English equivalents for the closer relationships; these will be used hereafter for the sake of clarity whenever possible.[5]

COMANCHE KINSHIP TERMS AND THEIR ENGLISH EQUIVALENTS

có·ʔ (có·ʔ)	g.g.p.; g.g.cil.
kĭ' nuʔ (kĭ'nhŭ)	f.f., f.f.b., f.m.b., f.f.si.h., f.m.si.h.; *m.s.*: s.cil., b.s.cil., si.s.cil., w.b.s.cil., w.si.s.cil.
hu''ciʔ (hu'cɪ)	f.m., f.m.si., f.f.si., f.m.b.w., f.f.b.w.; *w.s.*: s.cil., si.s.cil., b.s.cil., h.si.s.cil., h.b.s.cil.
to'koʔ (to'ko)	m.f., m.f.b., m.m.b., m.m.si.h., m.f.si.h.; *m.s.*: d.cil., b.d.cil., si.d.cil., w.si.d.cil., w.b.d.cil.
ka'kuʔ (ka'kŭ)	m.m., m.m.si., m.f.si., m.m.b.w., m.f.b.w.; *w.s.*: d.cil., si.d.cil., b.d.cil., h.si.d.cil., h.b.d.cil.
ʔa''pĭʔ (ʔa''p(ĭ))	f., f.b., m.si.h., m.si.h.b.
pi'aʔ (pi'a)	m., m.si., f.b.w., f.b.w.si.
ʔá'raʔ (ʔa'ɣhA)	m.b., f.si.h.; *m.s.*: si.cil., w.b.cil.
pa'haʔ (páhA)	f.si., m.b.w.; *w.s.*: b.cil., h.si.cil.
pa'viʔ (pávɪ)	o.b., *if older than speaker:* f.si.s., f.b.s., m.b.s., m.si.s.; *w.s.*: h.si.h.
ta'miʔ (ta'mɪ)	y.b., *if younger than speaker:* f.si.s., f.b.s., m.b.s., m.si.s.; *w.s.*: h.si.h.
pa'ciʔ (pa'cɪ)	o.si., *if older than speaker:* f.b.d., f.si.d., m.b.d., m.si.d.; *m.s.*: w.b.w.
na'miʔ (na'mɪ)	y.si., *if younger than speaker:* f.b.d., f.si.d., m.b.d., m.si.d.; *m.s.*: w.b.w.

cerned with the historical and structural aspects of the problem, that is, whether similar kinship systems always implied similar social structure in comparable cultures and vice versa. As no one denies the association of *some* specific behavior with the use of kinship terms within any society, it does not appear necessary to take a position here relative to this question.

[4] Eggan (1937).

[5] Hoebel has already presented such a table. However, he does not distinguish between the descriptive and the address forms, nor does he include all the terms here listed. Therefore it seems advisable to present the complete system again. *See* Hoebel (1939), pp. 441–442.

Most abbreviations used should be obvious. A few may be amplified: cil (children), *m.s.* (man speaking), *w.s.* (woman speaking).

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

sa'mu'pi? (sa'mup)	*m.s.*: si.; *w.s.*: b.; also cousins of opp. sex.
ta'ka? (no address form)	b., si.: also cousins.
tu'a? (tua')	s.; *m.s.*: b.s., w.si.s.; *w.s.*: si.s., h.b.s.
pe'tI? (pe't(I))	d.; *m.s.*: b.d., w.si.d.; *w.s.*: si.d., h.b.d.
mo'na'pi? (mo'napI)	d.h., si.d.h., b.d.h.
hu''cipia'pi? (hu''cipia')	s.w., b.s.w., si.s.w.
cò·?a?a''pi? (cò·?a?a'p(I))	g.d.h.
cò·?api'a? (cò·?api'a')	g.s.w.
nImIco'·? (nImIco'·?)	*m.s.*: w.g.p.; *w.s.*: h.g.p.
nImIto'ko? (nImIto'ko)	*m.s.*: w.f., w.f.b., w.f.si.h., w.m.b., w.m.si.h.
nImIka'ku? (nImIka'kU)	*m.s.*: w.m., w.m.si., w.f.si., w.m.b.w., w.f.b.w.
ya'hi'pi? (ya'hip)	*w.s.*: h.f., h.f.b., h.m.b., h.f.si.h., h.m.si.h.; h.m., h.m.si., h.f.si., h.m.b.w., h.f.b.w.
kU·'ma'pi? (kû'map(I))	*w.s.*: h., h.b., si.h., si.h.b.
kwI''p (kwI'h(I))	*m.s.*: w., w.si., b.w., b.w.si.
te'?cI (te'?cI)	*m.s.*: w.b., si.h.
pa'hapia'pi? (pa'hapia'pI?)	*w.s.*: h.si., b.w.
ha'ipia (ha'ipia)	*m.s.*: w.si., b.w., b.w.si.; *w.s.*: h.b., si.h., si.h.b.
ha'ic (ha'ic)	*m.s.*: male friend; w.si.h.(?); f.b.s., f.si.s., m.b.s., m.si.s.
tI'·i? (tI'·i)	*w.s.*: female friend; h.b.w.(?); f.b.d., f.si.d., m.b.d., m.si.d.

It is important to recognize that, with one somewhat confused exception (háic), these relationship terms each apply to a group of individuals of indefinite number, limited only by the fact that they normally belong only to one generation (of relationship, not age), and of course that they all stand in a certain relation to the speaker. While this group may have no functional significance as such, and certainly its limits are very poorly defined in any given case, this is the manner in which the kinship system operates at the verbal level. Behaviorally, there is no doubt that a certain focal individual (or individuals) is clearly recognized, and the rest of the group is more or less characterized, at least potentially, by this focal relationship; but to describe these groups exclusively in terms of such a person or persons is to give an erroneous picture of the actual structure of the system.

COMPARATIVE

In seeking for comparisons with Comanche kinship customs, one finds that these corroborate the already known origin of the Comanche as an offshoot of the Wyoming Shoshoni. Comparing them with the nearby Fort Hall and Lemhi Shoshoni relationship terminologies as given by Steward[8] one finds such extreme similarity, both phonetically and conceptually, that a very close historical connection between the two is indisputable. The only real difference is a negative one: the Comanche have no terms for a child's spouse's parents, and thus

[8] Steward (1938 a), pp. 297–306.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

601 171 do not consider them relatives. The other difference of any importance is the substitution of a single unanalyzable term for the husband's parents noted above; the Lemhi Shoshoni have all four of the "our (children's) grandparent" terms possible, and the Fort Hall Shoshani three, according to Steward.

From this general Fort Hall area in southeastern Idaho, among the various Basin groups, similarities with the Comanche relationship terminology gradually decrease to the south and southwest, as might be expected.

Wider comparisons with Uto-Aztecan and other kinship systems may be found in a recent article of Shimkin's,[7] for such close similarities with the Basin groups permit his conclusions concerning the Shoshoni to be applied to the Comanche without modification.

APPLICATION OF THE TERMINOLOGY

601 While the structure of the Comanche kinship terminology is such that the number of people covered by it is theoretically infinite, it is obvious that there must be some limit to the size of the groups involved.

In the ascending generations, a limit is set by the terms at the third. Actually, the possibility that anyone old enough to use these words would have a great-grandparent living was fairly small, specially in the pre-settlement days. Furthermore, the Comanche had a tabu on mentioning the name of any relative or close friend who was dead, so that discussion of the family tree was never a pastime, and, in most cases, little children never knew or soon forgot who their great-grandparents were.

Beyond the third descending generation, one "runs out of relatives" also, and may select any terms one wishes to describe great-great-grandchildren and others of this generation. There is thus considerable variation to be found in these distant relationships. One informant started over with younger sibling terms, while another just repeated the designation of "great-grandchild." Naturally, these relationships are only a little more common than those with great-grandparents; they nearly always involve very old people and little children, and are usually not in a direct line of descent, permitting some discrepancy between age and generation.

Thus while there are occasional exceptions, the kinship terminology normally operates over a span of six generations, two above and three below that of the speaker.

Horizontally, however, there is no such limitation either of terminology or, directly at least, of mortality. No other mechanism is consciously recognized, nor is any apparent in a systematic examination of genealogical material. However, as a rough rule of thumb, it may be said that, with surprisingly few exceptions, the line of kinship ceases to be traced when it has passed through two marriage relationships between the speaker and the person under con-

[7] Shimkin (1941).

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

sideration, with no other blood ties to bridge the gap. The existence of the "unrelated" spouses involved in these second marriages as parts of the group of relations under consideration is recognized, and a number of relatives of theirs may even be given under questioning, but some different line of relationship, usually stemming from a purported "blood" tie, is selected by which to identify them. The completeness of this other identification is well illustrated by the fact that frequently, when an informant was asked what the correct term for one of these individuals would be through the line which had been under consideration, the answer could be shown by later checking to be incorrect.

Exceptions to this rule are, of course, relatively frequent, the most common cause being variations in residence. Thus the man from whom I collected a complete genealogy[8] spent the whole of the course of his fairly long second marriage with his wife's family, and thus became accustomed to using the proper terms for a great many of them, in spite of the fact that several were connected by lines involving two marriages beside his own. Another remarkably frequent situation was one in which another line of descent coincides with the one in question, and, reinforcing this last, causes the group to be considerably extended in size. There was no awareness of whether a given relationship should be traced back through one or the other line.

Personality factors are unquestionably also operative in governing the size of the kin-group; not only will relationship be more readily admitted or sought after with people one likes or who are high in prestige, and vice versa, but we also had a feeling that some people were much more anxious than others to surround themselves with as many relatives as possible and to be able to implement these relationships by knowing how to trace them, thus supporting the implication of admittance to the in-group of the addressee, and the mutual support and esteem there expected. This opinion was corroborated by some of the younger men, but we were not able to get any more direct evidence than this. Naturally, our knowledge of the personalities of the informants was comparatively sketchy as a result of our short contact with them. Dr. Clyde Kluckhohn has indicated that his extensive work with the Navaho has shown clearly that such a desire exists among certain individuals there, leading to an effort to expand the group of known kin as far as possible.

[8] Two complete genealogies were collected, one from a man (T), and the other from a woman (TY). T had been blind for the last twenty-eight years of his life, so that he did not always know some of the younger people. Other informants contributed more fragmentary genealogical information, limited both by time and their lack of interest in the subject, while all informants produced isolated examples and generalizations in response to questions. The two complete genealogies comprised 187 and 133 individuals respectively.

It should be noted that the phrase "line of relationship" refers to no functional kingroup, but only to those individuals through whom relationship is traced.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

601 Thus we see that in spite of these and other exceptional situations the size of the group of relatives which may be established through any given line of relationships is fairly definitely limited. Actually, however, it is quite clear that a Comanche could almost always call every other Comanche by a relationship term of some sort or other, and usually did. Of course, with a system which is completely repetitive, such as this one, it is only necessary to establish relationships with one person in the group, find out in which direction the term goes if it is reciprocal, and all the rest of the relatives will fall into place. This must have been of great assistance in the old days to someone changing band allegiance. At the present time there is seldom any real difficulty in locating a common relative with anyone in the tribe. The actual origin of most of these relationships is naturally lost; usually they will be phrased as "no real relation" or, at best, an "old relation."

But one may speculate that many of them are actual old lines, whose common origins have been lost, but which continue to exist parallel to each other. [582] [184] Several examples could be cited of potential beginnings for such lines; thus one informant (T) was told by his older sisters of a line of "real blood relation" to his father, and he kept this line quite distinct among his relatives. He felt that this would be a definite bar to marriage with any of the people involved; yet his "great-granddaughter" through this line married his "great-grandson" through an older brother. Thus the younger children had forgotten, or ignored, this relationship entirely. The old man was quite obviously very disturbed when this relationship was pointed out to him; he himself had not thought of it specifically before.

The wide disparity between actual age and terminological generation between some of these systems of floating relationships suggests at least that they go back a good many generations. The most striking instance of this involved the other informant from whom a genealogy was collected (TY). She kept several lines distinct, all stemming from relationships which her maternal grandfather, a famous warrior (Red Young Man), had observed and she had 602 noticed, but which he had never explained. Two of these happened to converge 601 upon a friend of hers in the form of husbands, the first of whom my informant [55] addressed as "younger brother," and the other as "great-grandfather."

She also said that before acculturation into the white patterns, when the name-tabus were strong, parents would never tell children even in private more than one or two names of deceased people who were of importance in the family tree, and would do little more than indicate by what term one should call so-and-so, warning that it was a close relationship. It is easy to see how these children could grow up in ignorance of why they used certain terms, and not very aware of the closeness of the relationship, and thus pass on to their children little more than the usage of the terms.

Whether or not this is actually the origin of the majority of the relationships recognized is a matter for conjecture. In any case, we do find these very

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

many lines of relationship which each person traces, running back and forth through most of the people he knows, overlapping and coinciding very frequently. Naturally, the use of such a system involves many choices between two or more possible terms to be applied to some certain individual. The choices have often been made by one's parents, and are just adhered to; but in many other cases this is not so. It is especially true when one marries, for in this way a large constellation of new relationships is established through one's spouse. Usually, the choice is made, and this usage is continued thenceforward; if the connecting relationship is broken through death or divorce, the person may or may not keep the terminology established by it. Sometimes, the two alternatives are both kept alive, and are used interchangeably; operations of this sort make it easy to go one step further, and manipulate the terms of kinship in situations where there is no actual justification for some particular usage except expediency.

In most cases the choice is quite clear-cut: one relationship is closer than the other, and it is automatically used. Thus when T married his third wife, another woman whom he had called wife, or *hâipia*, and with whom he had been carrying on a joking relationship, became his sister. With the day of his marriage he began to call her "sister," and continued to do so, practically without exception, until his own wife died; the sister relationship was then abruptly dropped again. There are a great many such instances; this one is especially interesting because the reciprocal joking relationship, which had been avidly pursued, was terminated quite as abruptly as was the use of the term, and, with his wife's death, was at once reinstated; thus the relationship was conceived of both terminologically and behaviorally as existing quite apart from the person through whom it was made, and no restrictions of mourning were associated with it afterward.

By this same marriage, another woman who had been related as a sister through another "old relation" became a wife and *hâipia*, and started joking with her new-found "husband." They joked a good deal, but when she began to get the best of him, he would call her "sister," to remind her of the other relationship, and she would have to stop at once. A related situation is one in which, for example, a man's brother's wife, who had always called him "husband," and who was potentially his wife through the levirate, would start calling him by a sibling term upon the death of this brother, in order to indicate that it was not necessary for him to fulfill his obligation of replacing his brother as her husband. A fair number of such shifts were recorded, in various relationships where potential marriage situations existed. TY called her second husband's mother and her sister by the proper parent-in-law terms; but as they grew older they became blind, and she used to help them a great deal. To signalize this dependency they felt toward her, they began calling her "daughter," and she called them "mother." A daughter-in-law who gets along unusually well with her husband's mother is quite frequently called by the closer term of

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

602 daughter; in the same way, a girl who has been reared to a large extent by her
601 grandmother, especially if she is an orphan, or illegitimate, will be called "daughter," and will reciprocate by calling her grandmother "mother." It is interesting to note that these relationships, however artificial they may be, are always consistent. A person will never use a special relationship term toward another unless this other reciprocates by using an appropriate term toward the first.

The closer terms of kinship which we have just seen substituted for more distant correct terms are also extended in their application to non-related or little-known people toward whom one wishes to show friendliness or respect. Thus a man will usually call a stranger "father," or "mother's father," depending on his age—this latter term is considered to denote the closest relationship, as far as warmth and dependence go, of the two grandfathers.

More formalized are such usages as the reciprocal joking which goes on between grandparents and grandchildren, which operates largely by means of their using various sets of kinship terms and then making jokes about their consequences; this will be considered in more detail in the next section. Also, if
[572] two persons standing in a certain relationship to each other each have close
[195] friends of the same sex as themselves, these two friends may playfully adopt parallel relationship terms toward each other. The terms in this case have a phonetic pattern slightly different from the normal usage.

Perhaps of the same nature is the custom whereby two young men may call each other *nīmūĭ'ʌ?*, "our girl friends," to signalize some affair which they had with two girls who were friends; this usage is said sometimes to continue throughout life, though no instances were recorded.

In these examples it is evident that the universal applicability of kinship terminology and the choices of relationships which are presented, together with extensions of its usage outside of genealogically traceable relatives, make this system a remarkably flexible tool in the hands of its users. With the selection of terms there is, apparently, a selection of behavior patterns also, always followed consistently by both parties involved.

The Comanche seem to follow the usual custom in regard to more distant relationships, wherein the behavior patterns found in the immediate family become gradually less distinct and demanding, and more permissive in nature, providing opportunities for fulfilling them to any degree which the person wishes. Yet some aspects of behavior appear to persist very strongly; this is well exemplified by the alternation of sister and joking relationships already mentioned.

It remains now to see what these behavior patterns are which are associated with the relationship terms, and to what extent there is a distinct pattern for each term.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

BEHAVIOR PATTERNS[1]

In every situation, affectionate, formal, calm or excited, a kinship term is always the preferred form of address. There is no tabu on the use of the name for address, and it often has to be employed to distinguish individuals in a group, but this is not the kind nor respectful approach. Calling someone by his name when there is no real necessity for it is only to be done in anger, to show disdain, or perhaps with someone who is always irritable and no one cares for; thus TY called a "brother" she had acquired through her second marriage by name, because everyone always had—he was just an unpleasant man. It is doubtless this attribute of the terminology which makes it necessary, or at least strongly preferable, to have some relationship through which one may address any other Comanche one meets; the use of the terms to some extent provides the cues for the behavior of both persons, and tends to create a situation favorable to the speaker, especially in the use of relationships considered respectful. During peyote meetings, for example, the participants are always required to address each other by appropriate kinship terms.

As might be expected, these usages carry over into the folklore: coyote calls the other animals (unless they are bigger than he is) "little brother," as is so often the case, and the other animals similarly address each other by relationship terms. It is also significant that words for "sibling" or for "friend" are used to describe two animals, plants, etc., that are similar to each other.

For convenience in presentation, the material on behavior between relatives is grouped roughly by generation and by type of relationship, with distinctions made within these groups. The use of the present tense in these descriptions does not, of course, imply that these patterns still retain their full strength. Unless otherwise noted, all discussion is based on the culture at its pre-reservation peak.

Siblings. The relation between siblings of the same sex, and to a certain

[1] A large amount of the material used in this section was collected by Miss Kaarina Alho and Miss Nathalie F. Sampson from women informants; I wish to express to them my extreme gratitude for their kindness and generosity in thus making available for my use the results of several weeks of intensive work.

Due to the limited time at our disposal, and the fact that our emphasis was primarily on linguistics, the material here is perhaps rather scanty and occasionally inaccurate. However, it will suffice to provide a general outline of behavior in the most important relationship situations; I doubt that any important aspects have been completely omitted. It must not be overlooked that material obtained from the memory of participants in a broken culture tends to be slanted toward ideal types of behavior. While every attempt was made through searching questions and emphasis on actual cases to reduce this tendency, our data undoubtedly suffer from this bias.

A more rounded picture of Comanche culture as a whole has been presented by Kardiner (1945, pp. 51–80) using Linton's material. This may provide needed background in which to place these detailed patterns of behavior.

192 552 kaiwanĭ· *Kiowa* (-nĭ· may be translated as *people*); karó· *Caddo;* cikshó·nĭ· *Chickasaw;* sikapo? *Kickapoo;* siminó·? *Seminole;* so-soni? *Shoshone;* navó· *Navaho;* yu·ta? *Ute, Paiute.*

In contrast to the above a number of tribal names are descriptive: ?a?a·nĭ· *Crow (horned people);* ?esikwita? *Mescalero Apache (grey feces);* papicimina? *Sioux (head unjointed);* ta·si?nĭ· *Kiowa-Apache (spotted people* (from small-pox); saritihka? *Arapaho (dog eaters);* sianavo· *Cheyenne (feather striped* from their arrows).

197 648 Early and brief French contacts have left no apparent trace on Comanche. And in spite of the wide and relatively frequent relations, both friendly and hostile, between the Comanche and other tribes of the Plains and the Southwest, only a few loanwords from other American Indian languages seem to have been taken into Comanche, and those noted are of doubtful origin. This may in part be attributed to the wide-spread use of the sign language and to what seems to have been a rather large amount of multilingualism among the Plains tribes.[99] It seems especially noteworthy that the Kiowa, who lived in close association with the Comanche since the close of the 18th century,[100] had so little direct effect on the Comanche language. One word, ?aho *thank you,* seems to have been borrowed from Kiowa.

197 198 197 [192]

601 192 197 The kinship term, haipia, which refers to siblings-in-law of the opposite sex between whom the typical Plains reciprocal joking relationship obtained may, as Gladwin suggests,[101] have been borrowed along with

[99] James Mooney, Calendar History of the Kiowa Indians, 17th Annual Report, BAE p. 156 (Washington, D. C.; 1898), mentions that Kiowa children were often left with the Crow for 2-3 years to learn the language and thus preserve old friendships.

[100] James Mooney, Calendar History of the Kiowa Indians, 17th Annual Report, BAE p. 163 (Washington, D. C.; 1898).

[113] [101] Thomas Gladwin, Comanche Kin Behavior, AA 50: 73-94, p. 81 (1948).

[p. 231-A]

192 197 [60] the custom, although he has been unable to locate a similar word in another tribe.

The Comanche word for *corn*, *hani·vI,[102] is another word of doubtful origin. It is unanalyzable and could either be borrowed or an extension of an older word whose original meaning is lost. The Pima word hu·nI[103] *corn*, appears to be related. If so, the direction of diffusion would presumably be from Pima to Comanche. There are apparently no cognate forms in the more closely related Shoshonean and Southern Paiute languages.[104]

192 197 193 Comanche loanwords are treated as native stems and are subjected to the regular morphological processes with little or no recognition of the fact that they are loanwords. As an example we might cite the following forms of tehnsé·?, from English *ten cents:* tehnsé?nï· *plural;* tehnsé?ma? *it is ten cents;* tehnsé?wahtĭ *without ten cents;* tetehnsé·? *ten cents each;* tehnsé·kU *add, raise ten cents* (in gambling); tehnse·vetĭ *to the amount of ten cents;* tehnsé·matĭ *part of ten cents;* tehnsé·matïma? tïmï· *spend part of ten cents;* tehnsé·ma?ai? *together with ten cents;* nïrehnsé·? *my ten cents;* tehnsé·nïhW *two dimes.*

121 Occasionally loanwords may be adopted in several of their proper grammatical forms. Nahuatl has absorbed a fairly large number of Spanish nouns in both their singular and plural forms.[105] English has

[113]

[102] Randolph B. Marcy, Exploration of the Red River of Louisiana in the year 1851, 32d Congress, 2d Session, (Washington, D. C.; 1853), records hah-ne-be-tah, possibly hani·vItĭ, *for corn.*

[103] George Herzog, Personal Communication.

[104] Edward Sapir, Southern Paiute Dictionary, Proc. of the Amer. Academy of Arts and Sciences, 65: 537–730, p. 589 (Philadelphia, Pa.; 1931), gives ?i?á-pĭ *what is planted,* for corn in Southern Paiute; also on p. 641, qom·ɨ', an older word is listed. Ralph V. Chamberlain, Animal Names and Anatomical Terms of the Gosiute Indians, Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, 60: 74–103, p. 374 (1908), notes komu for corn in Gosiute. This is a loanword from English.

[105] Franz Boas, Spanish Elements in Modern

[p. 231-B]

192 **tutú·?** *automobile, train, anything that whistles* [onomatopoeia].

195 **kaká·?, kaká** *bird; head louse.*

kanɪ́·? *house, tipi* [kánhI].

kokó·? *fruit, candy, cookies; any snack between meals;* give me. . . .

cikɪ́·? *chicken* [English].

cicɪ́·? *breast, bottle, milk, I want to be suckled!* [pɪ́cip *milk, breast*].

cɪ́?ci?, pɪ́ci? mother to child when she is going to nurse it.

mamá·? *horse;* said by child when it wants to be carried on someone's back.

mamá·? *mother* [English].

mukɪ́·?, mu·kɪ́·? *giant, owl, bogey* (to scare child) [related to mú·pic, the legendary *giant owl*].

mumú·? used to scare child; child's exclamation of fright; *the dark, thunder; cow.*

naná·? *it might hurt, get away; blood, sore, hurt;* said if baby doesn't feel well; if it is bitten or hurt by another child [see ?aná·].

nɪnɪ́·? *doll; baby; little ones of animals; little. . . .*

nɪnɪcɪ́·? *dear little doll, baby* [related to the pronominal prefix, nɪ-, *I, me*].

wa?ó·?, wa·?ó·? *cat* [adult: wá?o·].

?ɪ́?sI, nɪ́?ɪsik *cover me!* [adult: ?ihɪ́kI, nɪ́?ihɪ́kI].

wɪ́?asI *penis* [adult: wɪ́?A (wɪ́?asi? male personal name *one who has a penis*)].

The sI here, and also in the baby word for *vagina,* tá?sI, is probably derived from the diminutive suffix, -cI.

RELATIONSHIP TERMS

601 195 **piá** *mother* (the regular adult word; there is no special baby word in common use).

pipiá said by some babies.

?apɪ̄·? *father, father's brother, father's haic (friend)* [?ápɪ̄ address form; ?áhpɪ? reference form].

?atá·? *mother's brother, husband of mother's friend* [?árhA address form; ?ára? reference form].

pacɪ́·? *older sister* [pácI address form; páci? reference form].

[p. 2-A]

601 195 namí·ʔ *younger sister* [námI address form; námiʔ reference form].

takú·ʔ *sibling* [tákA address form; **táka**ʔ reference form].

tamí·ʔ *younger brother* [támI address form; tamiʔ reference form].

paví·ʔ *older brother* [pávI address form; páviʔ reference form].

pahá·ʔ *father's sister* [páhA address form; páhaʔ reference form].

kakú·ʔ *grandmother* [*mother's mother* is the adult meaning; kákU address form; kákuʔ reference form].

tokó·ʔ, totó·ʔ *grandfather*, sometimes *father* (this form used by a younger child) [*mother's father* is the adult meaning; tókO address form; tókoʔ reference form].

The following terms may also be used if the child is old enough to make the distinction: kĭnú·ʔ *father's father* [kĭ̂nU address form; kĭ̂nuʔ reference form]; hucí·ʔ *father's mother* [húcI address form; húciʔ reference form].

These kinship terms, other than those used for *father*, *mother*, and *grandparents*, probably appear relatively later in the child's vocabulary. Just how far they are extended to include those relatives normally subsumed under them in adult usage is not certain, but they may be taken to apply primarily to those persons designated above or their surrogates. It is interesting to note that the maternal grandparental terms are those first [591] used for all grandparents. This suggests matrilocal residence, or at least more intimate contact with the mother's parents than with the father's.

195 In addition to the above list of formal baby words several characteristics of Comanche children's speech may be mentioned. 195 There is a tendency for children to add the diminutive-endearing suffix, -cI and the re- 193 lated -aI to words; e.g., haicí·ʔ for haíc *friend*. Reduplication,[3] as might be inferred

[113] [3] Kroeber mentions this tendency to reduplicate in the speech of a Zuni child of 23 months whom he observed. A. L. Kroeber, The Speech of a Zuni Child, AA 18.529-34; the only published account of the speech development of a primitive child.

[p. 12-B]

/page 31 continued/

C K 129 personally but not the society. As the job takes more and more time it also begins to cut into my field time to a rather dangerous extent. So what started out as seemingly an asset has rapidly become the millstone around the neck.

C K 129 122 Our decampment from Lawton to the little hill town of Medicine Park has done much to offset my identification with Lawton. Informants are happy to visit with us in Medicine Park but would not do so when we were in Lawton. We have been able to keep up continuous contact C K 124 129 with two families, fairly good contact with two others, and then there are various older people that our introductions take us to see for specific information. It is not easy to keep good contacts with a representative cross section due to the fact that our major introductions come from just two families. While neither family cares who we consort with in the other tribe they are a little careful to see that we deal with approved people in their own tribe. Ergo we know the Kiowa Christians and the Comanche peyotists which is something of an unequal situation for good comparisons.

Kinship Organization and Behavior, Settlement Patterns and Mobility

C K 601 178 602 While it is possible to trace the breakdown of the tribal and band organization and the traditional authority of the chiefs etc., it is, so far, almost impossible to gauge changes in the kinship organization. The work done in this area, however, has pointed out some differences between the Comanches and Kiowas. Unfortunately, no firm conclusions may be reached without statistical evidence which is not forthcoming.

C K 592 Since the settlement on individual allotments, the Comanches and Kiowas have taken the great step toward living as nuclear families. As far as I can determine, the Kiowas still live in such a manner that K 361 592 the members of the extended family have allotments fairly close together. Most of the Rowell, Quetone, and Horse families are located to the north of Meers. The Rowell family alone, including half siblings, is settled along the Meers to Porter Hill road. There are, of

/page 31 continued/

K 361 542 course, /32/ some members living further away and many of the younger people between thirty and twenty years old are either away at school or off on relocation. Nevertheless, the homesteads remain in definable clusters. The Comanches seem to be more dispersed by comparison. C 361 This would seem to be the case even in those instances when the original homestead of 1901 was adjacent to the allotments and homes of the other family members. People frequently move to purchased allotments. This impression may be due to coincidence in the few samples I have but there is some verification for my impression from the Wermeys who run the Indian Arts and Crafts Cooperative in Anadarko. According to them the Comanches are far more scattered and more difficult to locate than the other tribes in the area with whom they deal. K [361] Although both the Kiowas and Comanches took allotments on the sites where they were camped at the time the law was passed (coincident with band affiliation) the Comanches seem to have broken up this pattern more than the Kiowas or the other tribes further to the north. Perhaps the original band affiliations were less cohesive due to their comparatively large size. In spite of the fact that more mapping may be done it will be virtually impossible to get enough typical samples to tell the true story. The same problem rears its ugly head in respect to the actions of the younger generation. We have no simple means by which to determine the extent and nature of the dispersion of the younger generation. Although the relocation program does not appear to be having significant results other factors (see first report) seem to be moving many of the young people into towns.

As much as the settlement patterns may be changing, effects C K 484 601 602 that such changes have, or may have, upon the kinship organizations are interfered with to some extent by the increased mobility offered by the automobile and the constantly improving road network. This mobility gives the dispersed extended family more opportunity to keep [493] [491] up contact via frequent visits by auto. But here again it is virtually impossible for the single investigator to gather sufficient data.

/page 32 continued/

C K 484 Within a small peyote group will exist enormous differences in distance to be travelled. Two cars in a family will frequently distort the picture. The occupation of an individual will to a great extent determine the amount of travel time available regardless of the amount of interest in visiting, peyote, or pan-Indian affairs in general. Also, individuals who must commute long distances to a steady job will rack up high speedometer readings without spending much time visiting, etc. In fact, I have even observed some Comanches with widely dispersed kin and friends spending more time visiting than many Kiowas whole families live within a two mile radius. In spite of this, I still feel that the travel pattern of the Comanches and Kiowa is considerably different from that of the neighboring whites. Just how it can be measured or accurately described, however, I do not know.

C K 601 829 177 602 Turning now to the kinship organization, it is safe to say that the same complexity due to individual variations is to be found. Moreover, the attitudes toward change color the data given by informants. In this way the father of a family that has kept its kinship patterns (relatively speaking) may be convinced that the old system has disappeared entirely. The converse may also be the case.

C K [582] [191] The concept of the ideal pattern has been preserved by all the /33/ older people I have met, Kiowa, Comanche; mixed bloods, Christians and Peyotists. The pattern does not seem to be directly affected by inte-marriages except insofar as the mixed marriage may change the dominant language of the family. The actual behavior

C K 601 177 602 [161] [582] [588] [684] patterns are changing in many respects. One of the chief factors is the small size of the tribe (Comanche in this instance) which has forced marriages to occur within the exogamous group to an extent. Strictly tabu marriage have occurred both among the Kiowas and Comanches but these are still recognized as wrong and the participants are stigmatized. The sanctions are not as sever as the traditional ones, however.

30: Levy E-5 (ca. 1957) 1958 NO6 Comanche NO6
Oklahoma
Kiowa NQ15

/page 33 continued/

C K 601 178 602 [191] Among the Kiowas and Comanches, regardless of the community (peyote or Christian), or the degree of intermarriage, certain things are held in common. Old and middle aged people retain the kinship organization as recorded by the earlier workers in this field, almost to the letter. What variations I have found are scattered and are probably due to individual variation. Within the younger groups the degree of retention would seem to be variable with the amount of the native language that is still spoken and not with the nature of the home (mixed blood, white or inter-tribal; Christian or peyote; active or inactive in Indian affairs etc.). Although the younger age groups are especially anxious not to appear "primitive" to the Whites and will not admit knowledge of the language, the kinship system, or other earlier traditions, they often as not have the knowledge and do know to a greater or lesser extent what the kinship system is. In other words, it is the extent in the change of language which most directly seems to relate to the change in the kinship system. The observed factors causing acculturation would appear to operate upon the kinship system via the language medium. For example, that a young person lives in town and works with Whites and perhaps does not identify strongly with tribal tradition, etc., is not sufficient to bring about a change in his knowledge of and conception of the kinship organization in itself. If, however, he loses his grasp of the language or he does not speak the native language with his children then the whole system may be lost to those individuals. I have made the acquaintance of several young men who are strongly identified with Indian traditions but, due to the fact that the native language was not spoken much in the home, have no knowledge of the kinship system nor have they made any attempts to learn it. I have looked into white-Indian mixed marriages and the grown children of same and find that as long as the native language can hold its own in the household the knowledge of the kinship system will be retained. In view of this one may speculate on the effect that integrated schooling in Oklahoma will have on the

C K 601 191 177 602

/page 33 continued/

C K 601 191 197 602 younger generations in the next few years. It would not be surprising that the cumulative changes in Indian way of life during the past hundred years shall only be reflected in the changing kinship in one lump at one time. This rather than a corresponding curve representing gradual change.

As virtually all of the active Comanches and Kiowas are bilingual, they use English kinship terms when speaking to the Whites. As there is no serious reason for the Whites to come to grips with the tribal systems this accomodation is satisfactory whether the terms have been correctly applied or not. Thus an adequate and comparatively effortless accomodation has been made by the Indian which serves to insulate the operating kinship system from the pressures inherent in the culture contact.

C K 602 198 /34/Except for the aged, all the individuals I have had the opportunity to observe are becoming more lax in adhering to prescribed behavior. In those cases where behavior patterns are performed it is not taken "as seriously" as in the old days. Much of this is due to the loss of adequate sanctions as well as to the disappearance of many of the underlying cultural reasons for the traditional behavior patterns.

At first glance it appears that the Kiowas have maintained more of the traditional behavior patterns than have the Comanches. K 602 606 593 198 This may or may not be so. The Kiowas still practice (in varying degrees of laxity) mother-in-law avoidance. There is still much of the old respect-avoidance between siblings of the opposite sex. But as the Comanches never had these avoidances to start with (where they did it was to a much lesser extent) it is difficult to determine C 602 593 198 changes in the Comanche behavior patterns. John Pahdoponi insists that even those sibling avoidances which did exist in the past are gone today. But John is predisposed to see the old order as having been destroyed, and that in its entirety. The traditional Comanche allowed the brother and sister to speak face to face, to eat at the same table although not at adjacent seats and to ride together